

**Summary of the
Environmental Laboratory Advisory Board Teleconference
April 11, 2000**

WELCOME AND OVERVIEW

The Environmental Laboratory Advisory Board (ELAB) met via teleconference on April 11, 2000 from 1:00 - 4:00 p.m. Eastern Standard Time (EST). Dr. Wilson Hershey, Lancaster Laboratories and ELAB Chair, led the meeting. A list of action items is in Attachment A. A full list of meeting participants is in Attachment B. The meeting agenda is in Attachment C. The current status of action items from the February 15, 2000 meeting is in Attachment D. The current status of action items from the December 17, 1999 meeting is in Attachment E. A summary of the current status of all ELAB recommendations is in Attachment F. Dr. Hershey called the meeting to order with a brief welcome and identified the participants.

After the introductions, Dr. Hershey asked that the Board adjust the agenda to first address agenda item 8, **Key Stack and Field Sampling Issues**, as Mr. Dan Bivins, US EPA Office of Air (OAR) and Chair of the NELAC Field Activities Committee, had joined the meeting to discuss the current status of the stack testing accreditation standard. The Board agreed.

KEY STACK AND FIELD SAMPLING ISSUES

Dr. Hershey informed the Board that he had received correspondence from Mr. Scott Evans of Clean Air Engineering (see attached) expressing concern that industry's interests were not being adequately represented in the development of the stack testing accreditation standards. In light of this issue, Dr. Hershey asked Mr. Bivins to update the Board on the development of this standard and its current status.

Mr. Bivins explained that between the 1970's and early 1990's, the Source Evaluation Society, a professional association made up of stack testing companies, State inspection bureaus, EPA, and equipment vendors, was developing accreditation standards. However, this Society decided that the task was too overwhelming since most of its members were working on these standards on a volunteer basis. As a result, the Society asked EPA to take over the initiative. Mr. Bivins explained that NELAC formed an ad hoc committee to study the need for sampling standards. This committee wrote a white paper recommending that NELAC continue developing standards for stack testing and other types of sampling. In January of this year, the ad hoc committee became a standing committee. This standing committee then formed a subcommittee to continue development of the stack testing standards. Subcommittee members are Mr. Scott Evans, Mr. Howard Shiff of TRC Environmental Corporation (a large stack testing company), representatives from two small stack testing companies, a State inspection bureau, a local air pollution control agency, Mr. John Hosenfeld (contractor for OAR), and himself.

Mr. Bivins informed ELAB that the Source Evaluation Society passed a resolution at last week's meeting asking NELAC to delay development of a stack testing standard. However, Mr. Bivins stated that only six States were represented at the meeting and that most States favor developing a standard. In addition, Mr. Bivins explained that several small stack testing companies support NELAC's development of a standard, even though many of those companies are concerned about the effect the standard will have on their businesses. On the other hand, several large stack testing companies are opposed to the standard.

Because OAR believes this standard would improve data quality, Mr. Bivins would like a vote on at the June, 2000 NELAC meeting. At a minimum, that standard should cover all major headings or be a skeleton standard similar to the one NELAC began in 1995. He then solicited comments from the ELAB members on the standard and/or its development.

Mr. David McClure, OMNI Engineering Services, asked Mr. Bivins if the newest version of the draft standard was available and if the requirement for qualified/certified individuals had been eliminated. Mr. Bivins replied that the subcommittee dropped the requirement for individuals, which was identified as a major concern during the NELAC interim meeting in December, 1999. He also said the most current version of the draft standard (March) is not on the bulletin board yet, but he will try to have it posted by the end of the week.

Mr. Al Verstuyft, Chevron Research and Technology, asked Mr. Bivins to discuss the Ahot@ issues from the March 28, 2000 meeting (minutes attached) of the subcommittee responsible for developing the stack testing accreditation standards. Mr. Bivins stated that one of the major issues was the idea of Air Testing Method groups. He explained that at present there are between 100-200 Air Testing Methods that the subcommittee has condensed into eleven groups. However, at this meeting the subcommittee decided that eleven was still too many groups and accreditation would be cumbersome, costly, and difficult to schedule, especially for any type of field audit. Mr. Bivins noted that one approach the subcommittee is considering is the AHierarchy of Methods Complexity.@ He explained that since many methods are similar but have different levels of complexity, the subcommittee could develop a hierarchy of methods so that once a complex method has been demonstrated, less complex but similar methods automatically would be demonstrated as well.

Mr. Bivins stated that another Ahot@ issue was whether all firms should have to qualify for Group 1 (Methods 1-8) as a pre-requisite for being accredited for other method groups. The subcommittee decided to adopt this pre-requisite because Methods 1-8 are the core methods.

Mr. Bivins added that a third major issue was whether or not methods that already had certification (e.g., Method 9) should be included in the standard. The subcommittee decided not to include Method 9.

Finally, Mr. Bivins summarized the subcommittee's discussion on assessor qualifications. He said the subcommittee decided this issue, although a low priority, is important because States need to

identify the types of training assessors need to meet the requirements. The subcommittee decided to postpone development of these qualifications to a later date. Mr. Verstuyft then asked if the portable document format (pdf) file on Assessment Training Checklists discussed in the subcommittee's March 28th meeting minutes is the NELAC checklist or a different checklist. Mr. Bivins confirmed it is the NELAC checklist but mentioned that the State of Louisiana has developed another checklist. Dr. Hershey asked Mr. Bivins to send him Louisiana's checklist so that he could distribute it to the ELAB members. Mr. Bivins agreed. Mr. Bivins informed the Board that a gentleman in charge of stack testing in sections of Louisiana recently told him that Louisiana will accredit 60 stack testing companies using the March version of the standard. Furthermore, if the standard changes, Louisiana will use whichever standard is the most current.

Mr. McClure asked Mr. Bivins what was meant by Asupplier certifications for rental equipment@ in section 3.5.3 of the standard, ALaboratory Record Review and Collection.@ Mr. Bivins explained that large stack inspection companies own all of their own equipment but many of the smaller companies rent their equipment. He further explained that according to the standard, one of the things an assessor has to look at when on an assessment is whether or not a stack testing company has the equipment necessary to perform the testing for which it seeks accreditation. Mr. Bivins stated that section 3.5.3 aims to explain what to do if a company rents its equipment.

Mr. Verstuyft suggested that to ensure the remaining items on the agenda are adequately addressed, he, Mr. Bivins, and Mr. McClure have a separate meeting and report back to ELAB at a later date. They agreed and committed to provide the Board with a recommendation at the next meeting on whether or not the standard should be passed in June given the Source Evaluation Society's request for a delay. The Board scheduled the next conference call for May 11, 2000. Dr. Hershey introduced the next item on the agenda, AReview February 15 Minutes.@

Action Items:

Mr. Bivins will e-mail Louisiana's assessment training checklist to Dr. Hershey for distribution to the ELAB members.

Mr. Bivins, Mr. McClure, and Mr. Verstuyft will meet to develop a recommendation on whether or not the stack sampling standard should be passed in June and will report back at the May 11, 2000 meeting.

REVIEW FEBRUARY 15 MINUTES

The minutes and action items from the February 15, 2000 meeting were reviewed and updated as appropriate (see Attachment D).

SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS:

1. Performance Based Measurement System (PBMS):

Mr. Gearhart led discussion on the status of the PBMS Subcommittee. He noted that a number of initiatives from the February 15, 2000 meeting are ongoing, and he provided the group with an update:

Task 1 - The subcommittee is still working on the draft letter to EPA from ELAB asking for clarification of PBMS intent. This effort is being headed by Mr. Jerry Parr, Catalyst Information Resources, LLC. Mr. Gearhart and Mr. Parr have already begun preliminary communication on the content of the letter. Mr. Gearhart stated that he still intends to have the draft letter to Dr. Hershey by May 1, 2000.

Task 2 - The subcommittee is continuing work on the critical review of PBMS. Mr. Gearhart noted that he has sent a complete outline and schedule for completion of the critical review to Dr. Hershey. Dr. Hershey asked Mr. Gearhart to re-send him those materials so he can distribute them to the ELAB members.

Task 3 - The subcommittee is still planning a stakeholder forum/presentation on PBMS at the NELAC meeting in June, 2000. Mr. Gearhart stated that the subject matter of the presentation will be the work of the ASTM Task Group in creating the draft standard guide. He added that Mr. David Friedman, US EPA Office of Research and Development (ORD) and Dr. Mark Marcus, Waste Management Federal Services of Hanford, Inc, are preparing the presentation. Dr. Marcus noted that he e-mailed Mr. Gearhart and Mr. Friedman an outline and a summary of materials he developed for a presentation he made three weeks ago at a Department of Energy (DOE) workshop. Dr. Marcus explained that these materials can be used as a starting point for the June, 2000 presentation.

Mr. Gearhart noted that the subcommittee still needs to plan in more detail who will be presenting, who the intended audience will be, and how long the presentation will last. He added that they are planning on doing a stakeholder presentation to either the ELAB group or a larger audience at the June, 2000 meeting, but that the exact audience had not yet been determined. Dr. Hershey asked that the presentation be made at the open forum. He then asked Ms. Lisa Doucet, US EPA Office of Environmental Information (OEI), to find out if the subcommittee can have the open forum room for an additional hour. If not, Dr. Hershey suggested the presentation take place at the end of the forum so that if people want to continue discussions after the end of the session, they can get together at a different location and do so.

Mr. Gearhart turned discussion to the status of ELAB recommendations as they pertain to PBMS. He noted that no further action is needed on any recommendations except two.

ELAB recommendation no. 15 - pending response from Mr. Friedman.

ELAB recommendation no. 27 - completed.

Dr. Hershey commented on the lack of initiative on PBMS within the Agency. He suggested that the Board's expectations with regards to PBMS implementation might have been too high and therefore, the Board is disappointed with the outcome. Dr. Hershey asked Mr. Gearhart if ELAB should take a more practical approach by working with the most receptive office to develop a workable procedure rather than trying to implement PBMS within all of the program offices at once. Mr. Gearhart responded that he and Mr. Parr believe that ELAB should recommend PBMS be used to complement existing reference methods in the various offices. He suggested that this would be a natural extrapolation from the current status of PBMS.

Discussion ensued on the problems with PBMS implementation. Mr. Friedman stated that one major problem is the difficulty in developing the training courses necessary to teach the Agency how to implement PBMS. He added that the PBMS workgroup is meeting on April 12, 2000 to discuss that very matter. Mr. Friedman explained that another major problem right now is the difficulty in developing the materials needed to make PBMS work. Mr. Friedman noted that implementing PBMS will be difficult if the necessary tools for its implementation cannot be developed. Mr. Friedman added knowing whether or not a method works for its intended purpose on an individual basis is easy. The difficult question is how to set up a method validation standard that would be widely applicable. Mr. Friedman explained that this issue has held-up progress.

Dr. Hershey agreed that these are problems. He suggested EPA proceed with PBMS implementation in one office while continuing to try to implement it on a more widespread basis. Dr. Marcus recommended working with the Office of Solid Waste (OSW). Mr. Friedman suggested they talk to Mr. Barry Lesnik, OSW. Dr. Hershey asked Mr. Gearhart to speak with Mr. Lesnik and ask him what steps his office is taking in implementing PBMS. Mr. Gearhart agreed. Mr. Friedman also suggested calling Ms. Denise Wright, Branch Chief of the Office of Prevention, Pesticides and Toxic Substances (OPPTS), as her office is having to incorporate PBMS into the PCB regulations. Mr. Gearhart agreed to do that.

Mr. Gearhart asked any ELAB member who would like to have input to ELAB's letter to EPA on PBMS to contact Mr. Parr who is heading up that effort.

Action Items:

The PBMS Subcommittee will continue to work on the draft letter to EPA asking for clarification of PBMS intent and will try to have the draft to Dr. Hershey by May 1, 2000.

Mr. Gearhart will resend Dr. Hershey the critical review outline and schedule so that Dr. Hershey can forward it on to the ELAB members.

Ms. Doucet will find out if ELAB can have the open forum room at the June, 2000 meeting for an additional hour to allow adequate time for the stakeholder presentation.

Mr. Gearhart will speak with Mr. Barry Lesnik, OSW, about the steps his office is taking in implementing PBMS. Mr. Gearhart will also contact Ms. Denise Wright, OPPTS, to discuss the inclusion of PBMS in the PCB regulations.

2. Regulatory Consistency:

Ms. Zonetta English, Louisville and Jefferson County Metro Sewer District, said she recently inherited the subcommittee and has been trying to contact Ms. Marlene Moore, Advanced Systems, Inc., for a briefing on the issues of concern. Ms. English mentioned that she also asked Mr. Parr about the subcommittee's issues and is waiting for information he agreed to send. Dr. Hershey reported that Mr. Parr is assembling that information for Ms. English.

Dr. Hershey asked the participating ELAB members to summarize the key issues for Ms. English. Mr. Gearhart responded that Ms. Moore had suggested the need for consistency between NELAC's voluntary standards and EPA's regulations that prescribe requirements for methods. For instance, the NELAC Quality Control (QC) Standards are not consistent with those in Office of Water (OW) regulations. Dr. Hershey said the primary issue is to ensure that NELAC standards are consistent with actual regulatory practice.

3. Third Party Assessor Credentials:

Mr. Marcus updated ELAB on the status of the Third Party Assessor Credentials Subcommittee. He stated that he has drafted a Charter for Technical Competence of Third Party Assessors which he has distributed to the other subcommittee members for their review. Dr. Marcus added that once he incorporates the comments of the subcommittee members into the draft charter he will send it to Dr. Hershey to be distributed to the ELAB members. Dr. Marcus felt he would have the draft charter to Dr. Hershey by April 15, 2000. Dr. Marcus also noted that the subcommittee is planning to give an interim report at the June, 2000 meeting and will have the project finalized by December, 2000.

Action Items:

Dr. Marcus will continue working on the draft charter and try to have it completed by April 15, 2000. Once completed, he will send it to Dr. Hershey to be distributed to the ELAB members.

4. Scope of Accreditation:

Dr. Hershey noted that Mr. Parr, who heads this subcommittee could not attend the conference call but provided a briefing on the subcommittee's status. Dr. Hershey said the field of testing work is essentially done and that Mr. Parr needs to write it up, run it by the subcommittee, and then send it to ELAB. Dr. Hershey added that Mr. Parr forecasts completion of this work by early May, 2000.

5. NELAC- International Standardization Organization (ISO) Consistency:

Dr. Hershey noted that Mr. Peter Spath, Eastman Kodak, who was scheduled to make this update, could not attend the conference call. However, Mr. Spath recently briefed Dr. Hershey on the subcommittee's status. Dr. Hershey explained that Mr. Spath and Ms. Roxanne Robinson reviewed the assessor training materials and concluded they need more work. The key issue is that the material focuses on compliance auditing rather than quality systems.

Dr. Hershey also noted that Ms. Robinson will be making a presentation on the major differences between ISO 25 and ISO 17025 at the June, 2000 open forum.

6. QC Standards:

Dr. Hershey mentioned that according to Mr. Parr's briefing, this effort is also essentially completed. Mr. Parr needs to prepare the write-up and plans to send it either to Dr. Hershey or all ELAB members by the end of the week. Dr. Hershey noted that both of Mr. Parr's subcommittee tasks will be nearly completed by the May 11, 2000 conference call.

7. NELAC White Paper:

Dr. Hershey informed the Board that Mr. Jim Kendzel, NSF International, who was scheduled to update ELAB on this effort, was unable to participate in this conference call. Dr. Hershey volunteered to check on the status of this white paper and report back to the ELAB members.

TRANSITION COMMITTEE REPORT

Dr. Hershey noted that Mr. Parr is heading up this effort. Since Mr. Parr was unable to participate in the conference call, Dr. Hershey said he would try to update the Board on the status of this committee. Dr. Hershey stated that there are two key issues: 1) EPA's funding of NELAC and finding alternate sources, and 2) laboratory accreditation across State lines.

Dr. Hershey observed that EPA has indicated its intent to remain involved but would like other parties to be involved too. Dr. Hershey added that other Federal agencies that seem to be interested in NELAC would be contacted, at least informally, to see if they could participate financially. Another idea is to charge more for the annual conference to defray certain conference costs. However, Dr. Hershey noted that this is not a complete list. He added that the Transition Committee feels the amount of EPA's funding is not nearly as important as EPA's continued central role in the program. He noted that States look to EPA for guidance and absent EPA's involvement, there would not be a program. Dr. Hershey commented that funding for NELAC is secure for at least one more fiscal year (i.e., through FY 2001).

Dr. Hershey turned discussion to laboratory accreditation across States. In order to clarify this

issue, Dr. Hershey provided an example. He explained that both New Jersey and New York offer CLP-equivalent accreditation through NELAC, but because New York is using a version of CLP, laboratories accredited in New York cannot obtain accreditation in New Jersey through reciprocity. In other words, each laboratory has to get accredited by each State separately. Dr. Hershey noted that the Transition Committee is looking at ways to resolve these issues. Ms. Jeanne Hankins, US EPA/ORD, commented that another issue is the fact that New Jersey is the only State that accredits for preparatory and clean-up methods. She noted, however, that there is a policy that one NELAP accrediting authority, can serve as the assessor to another accrediting authority. For example, New York could be the assessor for New Jersey's methods while also assessing for their own methods. Ms. Hankins stated that this provides a way for a laboratory to undergo only one on-site assessment. She added that this is not a requirement for every accrediting authority but rather an option to eliminate some of the redundancy. Ms. Hankins also pointed out that the accrediting authorities meet bi-weekly and are trying to find a resolution to these issues.

Mr. Gearhart reiterated that in order for NELAC to be successful long-term, it needs to be congruent with state regulatory practices and vice-versa, which is not the case now. Dr. Hershey agreed and noted that in the main standard, States have two years to get their laws changed. Ms. Hankins noted the one problem is with the way fields of testing are defined. She added that it was her understanding that the Transition Committee was going to recommend alternative ways to define fields of testing that will accommodate the types of problems Dr. Hershey has described. Dr. Hershey agreed.

SMALL LAB ISSUES

Dr. Hershey said the stack sampling issue was the main topic under this agenda item. He suggested moving on to the next item on the agenda unless someone had another issue to address. The Board agreed to proceed.

ACCREDITING AUTHORITY REVIEW BOARD (AARB) REPORT

Ms. Hankins provided the group with an update on the Accrediting Authority Review Board (AARB). She stated that one of the tasks of the AARB is to review any decisions made by the NELAC director for which the accrediting authority takes exception. She explained that she recently became concerned that the California program appeared to be out of compliance with NELAC standards. Consequently, California requested a review by the AARB. The AARB did not make any recommendation on this issue because the issue was resolved through further discussions between California and the NELAP Director. However, Ms. Hankins stated that the AARB was instrumental in resolving this issue through independent meetings with California and NELAC staff in order to clarify the issues and the positions of the two groups.

Ms. Hankins noted that the AARB is also working on a review of NELAP's assessment of NELAP Accrediting Authorities. The AARB selected reports that were available electronically. Ms.

Hankins has not yet been informed which reports are under review. However, Ms. Hankins noted that the AARB is working on this review and will make a presentation at NELAC VI on the process NELAP uses to evaluate NELAP Accrediting Authorities.

Ms. Hankins turned discussion to the composition of the AARB. She referred the group to an e-mail she sent out in February containing final language on the composition and purpose of the AARB (see attached). She stated that the Accrediting Authority Committee recommended who should be on the AARB, how the members should be appointed, and who should do the appointing. She noted that one recommendation was to allow ELAB to appoint one or two members of the AARB. However, the Office of General Counsel (OGC) told Ms. Hankins that because ELAB is an advisory committee, it does not have the authority to direct EPA on the composition of the AARB. Ms. Hankins encouraged ELAB to suggest possible AARB members. She noted that candidates must be either a Federal or State regulatory official, be from a NELAP accredited state, and not be on a NELAC standing committee. Ms. Hankins asked ELAB members to make their recommendations by June 1, 2000. Dr. Hershey stated that they would put this on the agenda for the May 11, 2000 ELAB meeting.

Mr. Friedman asked whether non-government people could serve if the AARB were made a federal advisory committee. Ms. Hankins responded that they could but that the states had stated their need for review by government officials only.

Action Items

ELAB will put making recommendations for AARB members on the agenda for its May 11, 2000 meeting

PRESERVED SAMPLE SHIPMENT UPDATE

Mr. Friedman provided the group with an update on the preserved sample shipment issue. He said that after a number of discussions with the Department of Transportation (DOT), he had decided that the petition for exemption approach would not be adequate as it would not be broad enough to cover the private sector. Mr. Friedman explained that he is now working with DOT on writing a petition for an actual change in the DOT regulations. He added that he is hoping to have this petition to DOT by June, 2000. Mr. Friedman also noted that he did not know what DOT's response time would be to the petition, but that he could have his management contact DOT in order to speed up the process if needed.

Action Items:

Mr. Friedman will aim to have a petition for a change in DOT regulations submitted to DOT by June, 2000.

REVIEW NATIONAL DATABASE PLANS

Ms. Hankins updated the group on the status of the National Database. She stated that work on the database is continuing with the assistance of a contractor, after a substantial delay due to a lack in funding. She stated that money is in the contract now, and that the goal is to finish the database by July 1, 2000, although that goal may not be met due to the delay.

Action Items:

Work on the National Database will continue, and the goal is to complete it by July 1, 2000.

KEY STACK AND FIELD SAMPLING ISSUES

Mr. Verstuyft stated that he had nothing to report beyond what was said at the beginning of the meeting, except that he asked Mr. Bivins to take **ELAB recommendation no. 38 and 41** to the Field Sampling Committee for their response at the June, 2000 meeting. After some discussion, the Board agreed that at this point nothing more needs to be done on the field sampling issue as the NELAC Field Sampling Committee is handling it. Mr. Verstuyft noted that he would simply report to the Board after discussions with Mr. Bivins.

Dr. Hershey revisited the issue of the correspondence he received from Mr. Scott Evans, which he briefly mentioned at the beginning of the meeting. Dr. Hershey noted that both Ms. Hankins and Mr. Bivins responded to Mr. Evans and that most of the issues are being resolved. Dr. Hershey stated, however, that he will close the loop by writing a response to Mr. Evans explaining the history of NELAP, informing him that a group is gathering more information, and that he understands Mr. Evans is now on a subcommittee where he can have direct input. The Board agreed.

Action Items:

Dr. Hershey will write a response to Mr. Scott Evans' letter stating concerns regarding the stack sampling accreditation standard.

OTHER ISSUES

Dr. Hershey turned discussion to ELAB's recommendation at the last meeting to remove section 5.12.4 in the NELAC standard (**ELAB recommendation no. 50**). He explained that he received a response from Mr. Joe Slayton, Chair of the NELAC Quality Systems Committee, stating that the committee disagreed with ELAB and is refusing to remove the section. Dr. Hershey reminded the ELAB members that they had decided at the last meeting to ask the NELAC Quality Systems Committee to remove section 5.12.4 because it is not the way chain of custody should be performed on a routine basis. Dr. Hershey further explained that according to the section, when a sample is out of the analyst's sight for a minute, the chain of custody is broken. Dr. Hershey stated that that virtually no laboratory in the country can adhere to that criteria.

Dr. Hershey informed the Board that Mr. Slayton told him he would be unable to convince the committee to remove the section, but he could suggest to the committee that it insert qualifiers, such as the words *Algal* and *evidentiary*, to show that this is not the normal laboratory chain of custody procedure. Dr. Hershey added that Mr. Slayton said he probably could convince the committee to add these words.

Ms. Hankins suggested that Dr. Hershey take ELAB's original recommendation to the Accrediting Authorities Committee, get their support, and then go back to the NELAC Quality Systems Committee. Dr. Hershey agreed and asked Ms. Hankins to try to get him on the agenda for the Accrediting Authorities Committee meeting on April 18, 2000. Dr. Hershey stated that if he could not get on the agenda for this meeting, he would try to speak at the next meeting. Mr. Friedman also suggested going to the Board of Directors. Dr. Hershey agreed and said he would try to address the Board of Directors at its meeting on April 13, 2000. Dr. Hershey stated that he will bring to these two groups ELAB's original recommendation of removing the section in its entirety. The Board agreed.

Dr. Hershey turned discussion to the response of the Office of Compliance to the ELAB Good Laboratory Practices (GLP) Subcommittee Final Report (see attached). He asked if any action needed to be taken. Mr. Friedman responded that he felt no further action was needed since the Office of Compliance agreed with ELAB's recommendation that GLP laboratories not be subject to NELAC. Dr. Hershey agreed and closed the issue.

Action Items:

Dr. Hershey will attend the Accrediting Authorities Committee meeting on April 18, 2000 and the Board of Directors meeting on April 13, 2000 and will present to these two groups ELAB's original recommendation of removing section 5.12.4 in the NELAC standard in its entirety.

MEETING WRAP-UP

Dr. Hershey adjourned the meeting at 3:15 p.m. EST. The next ELAB teleconference is scheduled for May 11, 2000.

Attachment A

Action Items

**Environmental Laboratory Advisory Board
April 11, 2000**

Item No.	Action	Date to be Completed
1.	Mr. Bivins will e-mail Louisiana's assessment training checklist to Dr. Hershey for distribution to the ELAB members.	As soon as possible.
2.	Mr. Bivins, Mr. McClure, and Mr. Verstuyft will meet to develop a recommendation on whether or not the stack sampling standard should be passed in June and will report back	May 11, 2000.

Item No.	Action	Date to be Completed
	at the May 11, 2000 ELAB teleconference.	
3.	The PBMS Subcommittee will continue to work on the draft letter to EPA asking for clarification of PBMS intent and will try to have the draft to Dr. Hershey by May 1, 2000.	Will try to provide draft to Dr. Hershey by May 1, 2000.
4.	Mr. Gearhart will resend Dr. Hershey the PBMS critical review outline and schedule for distribution to the ELAB members.	As soon as possible.
5.	Ms. Doucet will find out if ELAB can have the open forum room at the June, 2000 meeting for an additional hour to allow adequate time for the stakeholder presentation.	As soon as possible.
6.	Mr. Gearhart will speak with Mr. Barry Lesnik, OSW, about the steps his office is taking in implementing PBMS. Mr. Gearhart will also contact Ms. Denise Wright, OPPTS, to discuss the inclusion of PBMS in the PCB regulations.	As soon as possible.
7.	Mr. Marcus will continue working on the draft charter for Technical Competence of Third Party Assessors. Once completed, he will send it to Dr. Hershey to be distributed to the ELAB members.	Will try to have it completed by April 15, 2000.
8.	ELAB will put making recommendations for AARB members on the agenda for its May 11, 2000 meeting.	May 11, 2000.
9.	Mr. Friedman will aim to have a petition for a change in DOT regulations submitted to DOT by June, 2000.	Will aim to submit petition to DOT by June, 2000.
10.	Work on the National Database will continue, and the goal is to complete it by July 1, 2000.	Aiming to complete it by July 1, 2000.
11.	Dr. Hershey will write a response to Mr. Scott Evans' letter stating concerns regarding stack sampling accreditation standard.	As soon as possible.
12.	Dr. Hershey will attend the Accrediting Authorities Committee meeting on April 18, 2000 and the Board of Directors meeting on April 13, 2000 and present to these two groups ELAB's original recommendation of removing section 5.12.4 in the NELAC standard in its entirety.	

Environmental Laboratory Advisory Board Teleconference Participants April 11, 2000		
Name	Address	Contact Numbers
John Bigmeat	Cherokee Nation Water Treatment	828-497-3005
Zonetta English	Louisville Jefferson County	502-540-6706
Harry Gearhart	DuPont Engineering	405-372-7575
Wilson Hershey	Lancaster Laboratories	717-656-2300
Connie Hull	Kansas City Water Services Lab	816-454-7600
Jim Kendzel	NSF International	734-769-5184
Elaine LeMoine	Perkin Elmer	203-761-2771
Mark Marcus	Waste Management Federal Services	509-373-3026
David McClure	OMNI Engineering Services & OMNI	503-643-3788
Tom Peel	Geosyntec	561-995-0900
David Friedman,	US EPA/ORD	202-564-6662
Lisa Doucet	US EPA/OEI	202-564-1416
Jeanne Hankins	USEPA/ORD	919-541-1120
Pete Wilson		
Al Verstuyft	Chevron Research and Technology	510-242-3403

**Environmental Laboratory Advisory Board Teleconference
April 11, 2000**

AGENDA

1. Review February 15 Minutes

2. Subcommittee Reports

PBMS - H. Gearhart

Regulatory Consistency - Z. English

Third Party Assessor Credentials - M. Marcus

Scope of Accreditation - J. Parr

NELAC - ISO Consistency - P. Spath

QC Standards - J. Parr

National Laboratory Accreditation White Paper - J. Kendzel

3. Transition Committee Report - J. Parr

4. Small Lab Issues

5. AARB Report - J. Hankins

6. Preserved Sample Shipping Update - D. Friedman

7. Review National Database Plans

8. Key Stack and Field Sampling Issues - A. Verstuyft

9. Other Issues

10. ELAB Meetings at NELAC VI

June 26, 5:00 - 6:00 PM - Open Forum plus ISO 25/17025 Comparison

Presentation June 28, 1:30 - 5:30 - Regular Meeting

Action Items**Environmental Laboratory Advisory Board
February 15, 2000**

Item No.	Action	Date to be Completed
1.	Assessor training material should be posted on the NELAC website.	Ms. Hankins is still working on it. Will post as soon as possible.
2.	NELAC-ISO consistency subcommittee will provide ELAB with overview comparison of ISO 25 and ISO 17025.	Ms. Robinson is presenting at open forum June 26, 2000.
3.	David Friedman will send draft language concerning DOT/USEPA sample shipping issue to Wilson Hershey for ELAB review.	Completed. (For an update on the status of this issue see April 11, 2000 meeting minutes).
4.	Jeannie Hankins will supply ELAB with information on the proposed NELAC database.	Completed. (For an update on the status of this issue see April 11, 2000 meeting minutes).
5.	Contact various individuals to determine key issues regarding stack sampling standards and field sampling standards in general.	Completed. (Mr. Dan Bivins, OAR, updated ELAB at April 11, 2000 teleconference).

**ACTION ITEMS
ENVIRONMENTAL LABORATORY ADVISORY BOARD
DECEMBER 17, 1999**

Recom #	Item No.	Action	Date to be Completed
5A	1.	PBMS subcommittee (H. Gearhart, chair; E. LeMoine, M. Marcus, J. Parr) will address assigned issues.	Subcommittee formed. See April 11, 2000 ELAB meeting minutes for update on status of assigned issues.
22	2.	Regulatory Consistency subcommittee (Z. English, chair; B. Burmeister, H. Gearhart, D. McClure, M. Moore, J. Parr) will address assigned issues.	Subcommittee formed. See April 11, 2000 ELAB meeting minutes for update on status of assigned issues.
31	3.	Third Party Assessor Credentialing subcommittee (M. Marcus, chair; T. Peel, R. Robinson) will address assigned issues.	Subcommittee formed. See April 11, 2000 ELAB meeting minutes for update on status of assigned issues.
48	4.	Scope of Accreditation subcommittee (J. Parr & M. Moore co-chairs; G. Avery, Dan Hickman, C. Hull, C. Kircher, E. LeMoine) will address assigned issues.	Subcommittee formed. See April 11, 2000 ELAB meeting minutes for update on status of assigned issues.
44	5.	NELAC-ISO Consistency subcommittee (P. Spath, chair; C. McClure, R. Robinson) will address assigned issues.	Subcommittee formed. See April 11, 2000 ELAB meeting minutes for update on status of assigned issues.
49	6.	QC Standards subcommittee (J. Parr, chair; D. Loring, K. Watson) will address assigned issues.	Subcommittee formed. See April 11, 2000 ELAB meeting minutes for update on status of assigned issues.
46	7.	National Laboratory Accreditation Issues subcommittee (J. Kendzel, chair; L. Bradley, D. McClure, J. Parr) will address assigned issues.	Subcommittee formed. See April 11, 2000 ELAB meeting minutes for update on status of assigned issues.
			Completed.

Recom #	Item No.	Action	Date to be Completed
23	8.	Ms. Zonetta English will communicate to the NELAC Accreditation Process Committee ELAB's recommendation that an advisory appendix be written to address the issue of due process for laboratories.	
28	9.	ELAB will continue to gather information on AARB issues from the NELAC Program Policy and Structure (PP&S) Committee and from the AARB for discussion at a future ELAB teleconference.	Completed. Ms. Hankins provided an update on April 11, 2000 ELAB teleconference.
29	11.	Mr. David Friedman will report to ELAB when he receives a response from DOT regarding their shipping regulations.	Completed.
32	12.	Mr. Jerry Parr will review the ELAB Laboratory Assessment Subcommittee's recommendations on checklists and prepare them as a revised ELAB report for ELAB review and submission to NELAC and the OA Committee.	Dr. Hershey will send copy of report to NELAC chair by March 15, 2000.
39	13.	ELAB will investigate an expanded PT scope of accreditation. To this end, ELAB will request a report on this issue from the NELAC PT Committee at the Sixth NELAC Annual Meeting.	June 30, 2000.
42	14.	ELAB will request a report from the AA Group regarding how they propose to handle the issue of interim status on NELAP accreditation certificates.	CompletedCwill not say interim.
	15.	ELAB will review NELAC National Database reporting information issues.	Completed. Status of National Database reviewed on April 11, 2000 ELAB teleconference.

LISTING & STATUS OF ELAB RECOMMENDATIONS**Priorities Defined**

HIGH - activity is an urgent matter; an ELAB member has been assigned to monitor progress on the recommendation

MEDIUM - activity is of importance to ELAB; ELAB will monitor progress periodically

INACTIVE - activity either has been dealt with under another recommendation or is no longer applicable

COMPLETED - recommendation has been addressed or acted upon by ELAB or another organization

Rec #	Date of Rec	Recommendation	Notes	Action	ELAB Priority
1	2/6/97	The GLP Subcommittee will present a final report and recommendations at the next ELAB meeting in July, 1997.		ELAB completed report. Awaiting response from EPA EMMC Policy Council. Letter received letter from EPA/OECA 4/15/99; forwarded letter to NELAC.	COMPLETED
2A	2/6/97	The issue of how to define the basis for NELAC accreditation is of concern to the laboratory community and should continue to be addressed jointly by the NELAC Committees on Proficiency `testing and Program Policy and Structure. ELAB participation in the effort will be the responsibility of Mr. Coyner and Ms. Moore, who are members of the Proficiency Testing and Program Policy and Structure Committees, respectively.		Recommendation remains open. Awaiting action from NELAC PT and PPS committees and ELAB members.	INACTIVE
2B	2/6/97	ELAB recommends to EMMC and the		Recommendation remains	COMPLETED

Rec #	Date of Rec	Recommendation	Notes	Action	ELAB Priority
		NELAC Board of Directors, regarding proficiency testing, that the goal of the NELAC PT program should be to provide full-volume, real-world samples, keeping in mind considerations of practicality and cost.		open. Awaiting action from NELAC Board and EMMC Policy Council	
2C	2/6/97	ELAB recommends to EMMC and the NELAC Board of Directors, regarding proficiency testing, that the USEPA serve as the oversight body for the PT program, with the necessary resources and commitment to improve the current system. Alternatively, ELAB recommends that the oversight body be another government organization and that steps be taken to ensure a smooth transition.		Completed - NIST to serve as PTOB	COMPLETED
3	2/6/97	ELAB will recommend to the NELAC Board of Directors that the Program Policy and Structure Committee address the issue of how to recognize an appropriate role for Native American Tribal Nations in NELAC		Recommendation remains open. Awaiting action from NELAC Board and PPS committee	MEDIUM
4	2/6/97	With regard to the role of private-sector accrediting bodies in NELAC, ELAB will recommend to the NELAC Board of Directors that the NELAC national database include publicly available information describing the functions performed by individual private organizations for specific State programs		Recommendation remains open. Awaiting action from NELAC Board	HIGH
5A	2/6/97	ELAB recommends to the EMMC and the		Recommendation remains	HIGH

Rec #	Date of Rec	Recommendation	Notes	Action	ELAB Priority
		NELAC Board of Directors that US EPA's programs and Regions and the States work to implement PBMS consistently.		open. Awaiting Action from NELAC Board and EMMC Policy Council. Assigned to PBMS subcommittee 12/17/99	
5B	2/6/97	ELAB recommends to the EMMC and the NELAC Board of Directors that training in implementation of PBMS is needed for State Laboratory inspectors		Recommendation remains open. Awaiting action from NELAC Board and EMMC PC. Assigned to PBMS subcommittee 12/17/99.	HIGH
5C	2/6/97	ELAB recommends to the EMMC and the NELAC Board of Directors that a representative from the EMMC Work Group on PBMS work with the ELABG PBMS Subcommittee in the future		L. Williams, L. Autry, and B. Runyon, all from EPA, participated on the PBMS subcommittee	COMPLETED
6	7/28/97	ELAB recommends that EPA prepare a working set of PT sample design criteria which meet Program Office requirements to be used by the Proficiency Testing Oversight Body (PTOB) to include, at a minimum, concentration, interferences, media.	NELAC is working with EPA/EMMC to develop specifications for proficiency testing (PT) sample design criteria for use by the Proficiency Testing Oversight Body (PTOB). EPA is also working with NIST to develop a draft of the	Recommendation remains open. Criteria have been developed for the Water Pollution (WP) and Water Supply (WS) samples. ELAB wishes to reinforce that the recommendation is still important. Awaiting action from EPA Program	INACTIVE

Rec #	Date of Rec	Recommendation	Notes	Action	ELAB Priority
			standard. The draft is currently awaiting response from EPA	offices for criteria other than WP and WS. Will be addressed under #39.	
7	7/28/97	ELAB recommends that NELAC/NIST/EPA develop a protocol which can be used by the PTOB, through review and analysis of data, to assure program equivalency among PT providers. (See attached paper by Dan Tholen for starting point.) ELAB further recommends that this protocol be finalized as soon as possible to ensure the integrity of this program	The NELAC PT committee has worked with NIST and EPA to produce a draft standard for PTOB to assure equivalence among PT providers. An overview of the draft document, Handbook 150-xx, was given by NIST in the NIST Open Meeting on the morning of January 16, 1998. NIST reviewed Handbook 150-xx and requested public comments by March 15, 1998. Members of the ELAB were impressed with the draft document and the cooperation with NIST and EPA	Completed. ELAB sent a letter to EPA and NIST complimenting them on their work to date on developing Handbook 150-xx	COMPLETED
8	7/28/97	ELAB recommends to NELAC that the periodic PT studies occur at fixed times throughout the year. ELAB further recommends that initial and remedial PT samples may be obtained outside this schedule	ELAB has formerly recommended to NELAC that periodic PT studies be conducted at fixed times throughout the year. The problems created by labs not being able to receive or reinstate accreditation due to scheduling were discussed.	PT standards have been revised to indicate that accrediting authority may set the schedule. Remedial samples may be obtained	COMPLETED

Rec #	Date of Rec	Recommendation	Notes	Action	ELAB Priority
			ELAB is concerned about the effect of having only two opportunities per year for obtaining PT samples, will have on the accreditation process, both initial and remedial. recommends that ensure that the PT system not delay the laboratory accreditation process by more than thirty days.		
9A	7/28/97	ELAB recommends that the long range goal of NELAC be to develop a consistent approach to both scope of accreditation and PT program sample design, which recognizes the needs of the laboratories, the primary accrediting authorities, and the Agency, particularly with regard to performance based methods, similar technologies, and analytical capabilities.	The goal to develop a consistent scope of accreditation and PT programs has been endorsed by the NELAC PT Committee. ELAB discussed the need for the scope of accreditation and PT programs to address performance based measurement systems (PBMS), similar technologies, and analytical capabilities. It was suggested since PBMS is still under development by EPA, NELAC should monitor progress in the program to avoid any delays in the implementation of the NELAC PT program	Recommendation remains open. Awaiting action from NELAC PT and PPS committees. New ELAB subcommittee addressing scope of accreditation issue. Assigned to PBMS subcommittee 12/17/99	<i>ACTIVE</i>

Rec #	Date of Rec	Recommendation	Notes	Action	ELAB Priority
9B	7/28/97	ELAB recommends that the PTOB, during implementation of the PT program, require that each PT provider record and report PT results to both the accrediting authority and the PTOB on a method basis, by matrix and analyte.	NELAC is awaiting EPA specifications for reporting by method, matrix, and analyte. ELAB will recommend that the Proficiency Testing Oversight Body (PTOB) require that each PT provider record and report PT results to both the accrediting authority and to the PTOB to meet the EPA specifications.	Completed. The PT committee's proposed standards for program/matrix/analyte was adopted by NELAC.	COMPLETED
9C	7/28/97	ELAB recommends to NELAC that a task group monitor the impact on implementation of the discrepancy between PT program design and the scope of accreditation.		Recommendation remains open. Awaiting action from NELAC once program is operational.	INACTIVE
10	7/28/97	ELAB recommends that there is consistency between NELAC Standards and the EPA's PT Externalization program.	NELAC is working closely with EPA and EMMC to insure that NELAC standards are consistent with EPA's PT externalization program. A PT Committee meeting with EMMC in September 1998 indicated close cooperation in developing consistent PT standards.	Issue to be revisited in subsequent meetings.	ACTIVE
11	7/28/97	ELAB recommends that the proposed PT standards (including the Appendices) be adopted as presented.	The recommendation to adopt the proposed PT standards has been accomplished.	Completed.	COMPLETED

Rec #	Date of Rec	Recommendation	Notes	Action	ELAB Priority
12	7/28/97	<p>ELAB recommends to NELAC that the GLP decisions and the NELAC timeline be decoupled.</p> <p>ELAB further recommends that the GLP subcommittee report to the ELAB at the Interim Meeting with three options including a) status quo; b) Options 1+3+5; and c) lab accreditation.</p> <p>ELAB further recommends that ISO Guide 25 be explicitly considered to understand the value it offers to the GLP process.</p> <p>ELAB further recommends that the NELAC process be evaluated to identify the value added, if any. EPA will provide language to clarify that the NELAC Constitution and Bylaws reflect that decision-making and implementation of the GLP Program will continue as an exclusively federal program.</p> <p>The goal of this activity is to provide information to OECA and OPPTS management for a decision regarding the direction of the GLP program.</p>	Addressed in the GLP report.	Completed. GLP report has been forwarded to EPA - awaiting response from EMMC Policy Council.	COMPLETED
13	7/28/97	<p>ELAB recommends that before EPA promulgates a regulation, it must demonstrate and document that NQOs are achievable using available measurement technology. Recommendations modified to: ELAB recommends that before EPA publishes a method, whether in regulation or</p>	This recommendation was reconsidered and determined to need modification (see above). This issue was brought to the attention of the EPA Acting Deputy Administrator Peter Robertson	<p>Recommendation remains open. Awaiting response from Deputy Administrator.</p> <p>Assigned to PBMS subcommittee 12/17/99.</p>	HIGH

Rec #	Date of Rec	Recommendation	Notes	Action	ELAB Priority
		guidance, the method must be demonstrated reliable for its stated use.	on Marcy 9, 1999, at which time he agreed to pursue this issue with the EMMC Policy Council.		
14	7/28/97	ELAB recommends that EPA demonstrate that any new or revised regulatory measurement requirements are achievable on samples that represent the same level of analytical challenge as the matrix for which the regulation is intended, that is, don't publish a regulation without a method that works. (Ideally, this would be samples of the actual matrix to be monitored, as defined by the regulation.)	The Board voted to include an additional clarifying phrase to the recommendation.	Recommendation remains open. Awaiting response from EMMC Policy Council. Assigned to PBMS subcommittee 12/17/99.	HIGH
15	7/28/97	ELAB recommends that EPA consider the following remaining issues: PB Measurement System <u>vs.</u> PB Method Sample matrix Method Validation Method Compliance Interlaboratory Comparability Cost Laboratory Client Relationship		Recommendation has been superceded by final report of the PBMS subcommittee. Assigned to PBMS subcommittee 12/17/99. Waiting on response from Mr. David Freidman.	HIGH
16	7/28/97	ELAB recommends to NELAC that the initial approval of accrediting authorities should		Completed. The NELAC Transition Committee has	COMPLETED

Rec #	Date of Rec	Recommendation	Notes	Action	ELAB Priority
		occur simultaneously		implemented this recommendation.	
17	7/28/97	ELAB recommends to NELAC that the first round of NELAC accreditation of laboratories by accrediting authorities should also occur simultaneously.		The NELAC Transition Committee has implemented this recommendation.	COMPLETED
18	7/28/97	ELAB recommends to NELAC that prior to the designation of approved proficiency test (PT) sample providers as required by Chapter 2, accredited labs should be allowed to continue using existing PT sample providers. However, in the interim, frequency of PT sample analysis as required by Chapter 2 must be met.		Completed. The NELAC Transition Committee has implemented this recommendation. The PT committee has modified the PT chapter to accommodate this recommendation	COMPLETED
19	7/28/97	ELAB recommends to NELAC that Chapter 6 be further defined regarding Accrediting Authority recognition of States to address the conflict of interest between public and private sector labs, with respect to a State laboratory conducting routine environmental testing analyses. Further definition will include the specific guidance to avoid conflict of interest for an above stated Accrediting Authority.	The NELAC Accrediting Authority Committee has implemented this recommendation. At NELAC IV further complaints were raised that the AA committee had not adequately addressed this issue. See NELAC inputs to ELAB 6/30/99. Wording proposed for NELAC standards section 6.2.2.d responds to this concern.		COMPLETED

Rec #	Date of Rec	Recommendation	Notes	Action	ELAB Priority
20	7/28/97	ELAB recommends to NELAC that the issue of primacy State laboratories in accrediting non-primacy State laboratories be referred to the Accrediting Authority Committee for further consideration.		Completed. The NELAC Accrediting Authority Committee has implemented this recommendation.	COMPLETED
21	7/28/97	ELAB strongly recommends to NELAC a vote for adoption of the Standards with modifications as specified and passed by ELAB motions on July 28, 1997.		Complete. NELAC adopted the standards.	COMPLETED
22	7/28/97	ELAB recommends that EPA Program Offices become more active in NELAC and promulgate regulations that are consistent with the NELAC standards as appropriate.	Nancy Wentworth, co-chair of the EMMC Panel on Laboratory Accreditation, discussed the steps that are being taken within the Agency to obtain a consensus opinion. In a meeting on March 9, 1999, the EPA Acting Deputy Administrator Peter Robertson agreed to pursue this.	Recommendation remains open. ELAB sent a letter to the EMMC Policy Council Co-Chairs noting that NELAC is awaiting critical input from EPA Program Offices through EMMC. ELAB encourages the Agency to provide that input in writing as soon as possible. Awaiting response from EMMC Policy Council. Assigned to Regulatory Consistency subcommittee 12/17/99.	HIGH
23	1/16/98	ELAB recommends to NELAC that an advisory appendix be written that addresses	Recommendation remains open. Awaiting response from	Assigned to Z. English 12/17/99	COMPLETED

Rec #	Date of Rec	Recommendation	Notes	Action	ELAB Priority
		<p>the issue of due process for laboratories. This appendix must address the rights, responsibilities, and obligations of the laboratories and accrediting authorities. The discussion should include, but not be limited to:</p> <p>I. the right of the laboratory to see the audit report prior to action;</p> <p>II. the right of the laboratory to privacy during review;</p> <p>III. the right of the laboratory to appeal prior to suspension or revocation; and</p> <p>IV. the right of the laboratory to confidentiality</p> <p>V. .</p>	AP committee.		
24	1/16/98	ELAB strongly recommends to NELAC that, during consideration of inclusion of sampling into NELAC standards, all stakeholders be represented.	Recommendation remains open. Awaiting response from Field Measurements ad hoc committee.	This recommendation relates to 41 and will be addressed there.	INACTIVE
25	1/16/98	ELAB recommends that NELAC invite the Federal Partners Committee to make a report at NELAC IV (June 28, 1998) on their intention to 1) participate in NELAC; b) continue their own programs; and c) to serve as accrediting authorities.		B. Dutrow made presentation at NELAC IV plenary session on Federal Partners progress.	COMPLETED
26	1/16/98	ELAB recommends that EPA report on the		Awaiting response from	ACTIVE

Rec #	Date of Rec	Recommendation	Notes	Action	ELAB Priority
		Agency's action regarding PBMS and how it relates to the Quality Systems Chapter.		EMMC Panel on Laboratory Accreditation. Assigned to PBMS subcommittee 12/17/99	
27A	7/1/98	ELAB recommends that EPA continue the Office of Water streamlining effort as an intermediate step to PBMS.	EPA has decided to develop a formal PBMS program for the Office of Water, separate from the OW streamlining.	Recommendation remains open. Awaiting response from EMMC Policy Council. Assigned to PBMS subcommittee 12/17/99	COMPLETED
27B	7/1/98	ELAB recommends that a PBMS subcommittee be formed to develop and offer recommendations during NELAC IV [i] for integrating the development of NELAC and PBMS.	ELAB accepted on December 10, 1998, the report of the PBMS workgroup as a product of ELAB with the incorporation of previous findings and minor editorial changes. It was decided that a formal ELAB report will be sent by ELAB to EPA with an appropriate cover letter introducing the document and its issues. The PBMS working group report has been submitted to EPA's Acting Deputy Administrator Peter Robertson, during a meeting on March 9, 1999, at which	ELAB PBMS report on ELAB website.	COMPLETED

Rec #	Date of Rec	Recommendation	Notes	Action	ELAB Priority
			time he agreed to address this issue with the EMMC Policy Council.		
28	7/1/98	ELAB recommends that the NELAC Program Policy and Structure Committee review the structure of the AARB, consider expanding its charter to include an annual Management Systems Review of NELAP operations by an independent organization, include state members from the accrediting authorities, and address the timing of such reviews.		Recommendation remains open. Awaiting response from PPS committee.	MEDIUM
29	7/1/98	ELAB recommends that EPA and the Department of Transportation address the inconsistencies between the EPA preservation requirements and the DOT shipping requirements.	ELAB sent a letter to both EPA and DOT requesting prompt resolution to this impasse. In a meeting on January 11, 1999, the EMMC Policy Council Co-chair Noreen Noonan agreed to pursue this issue.	Response received from DOT stating that the shipping requirements will not be changed. Awaiting response from EMMC Policy Council. Mr. Friedman sending draft language to DOT to permit exemption of preserved samples.	HIGH
30	7/1/98	ELAB recommends that the proposed changes to the NELAC standards be adopted in the voting session scheduled for July 2, 1998.		Changes adopted.	COMPLETED

Rec #	Date of Rec	Recommendation	Notes	Action	ELAB Priority
31	7/1/98	ELAB recommends that a third-party assessor workgroup be formed to evaluate minimum credentials for third-party assessors, both individuals and organizations. The workgroup will also review NELAC Chapter 6 to determine if the criteria are sufficient for States to evaluate third party assessors and make recommendations for revisions if not.	A work group has been formed chaired by Sandra Wroblewski and Bill Kavanagh.	Awaiting product from work group. Assigned to Third Party Assessor Credentialing subcommittee 12/17/99.	HIGH
32	7/1/98	ELAB recommends that the ELAB Laboratory Assessment workgroup recommendations on checklists be forwarded to the NELAC On-site Assessment Committee for their consideration		Awaiting response from OA committee. Jerry Parr revised report for ELAB review and submission to NELAC. Report approved as final ELAB report for forwarding to NELAC and OA committee 4/29/99. Review of ELAB Laboratory Assessment subcommittee report assigned to J. Parr 12/17/99.	HIGH
33	7/1/98	ELAB recommends that the NELAC Accrediting Authority Committee further define and address conflict of interest between public and private sector laboratories.		Awaiting response from AA committee. This issue will be covered in recommendation 23. Assigned to Z. English	ACTIVE

Rec #	Date of Rec	Recommendation	Notes	Action	ELAB Priority
				12/17/99	
34	7/1/98	ELAB recommends that the NELAC Accreditation Process committee develop an advisory appendix that addresses the rights, responsibilities, and obligations of laboratories and accrediting authorities.		Awaiting response from AP committee. Issue will be covered in recommendation 23. Assigned to Z. English 12/17/99	ACTIVE
35	1/14/99	ELAB recommends that NELAC reach out to laboratory associations through its web page by providing relevant links and sample standard operating procedures, case histories, sample quality manuals, and work sheets to assist small laboratories.			COMPLETED
36	1/14/99	ELAB will ensure a flow of information and guidance to the NELAC Committees by submitting significant information on to the NELAC Membership and Outreach Committee.		Recommendation remains open. Awaiting input from ELAB. W. Hershey to inform M&O committee of FL and KS websites to assist small labs.	INACTIVE
37	1/14/99	ELAB recommends that NELAC continue to ensure that the NELAC standards contain only essentials to achieve the desired data quality; and, ELAB will make small laboratory issues a standing agenda item for future ELAB meetings.		Recommendation remains open. Awaiting input from ELAB. ELAB continues to include small laboratory issues on agendas.	INACTIVE

Rec #	Date of Rec	Recommendation	Notes	Action	ELAB Priority
38	1/14/99	ELAB recommends to NELAC that the NELAC Accreditation Process and Field Measurements Committees work together to develop a clear definition of critical terms (i.e., field laboratory, mobile laboratory, field measurement, and fixed laboratory) prior to defining the accreditation process for other than fixed laboratories; and, ELAB recommends to NELAC to exclude on-line monitors from its consideration.		<p>Recommendation remains open. Awaiting response from AP and FM committees.</p> <p>Assigned to A. Verstuyft, D. McClure 12/17/99.</p> <p>A. Verstuyft asked Mr. Dan Bivins, OAR, to take recommendation to the Field Sampling Committee for their response at June, 2000 meeting (4/11/00).</p>	HIGH
39	1/14/99	ELAB believes the current EPA proficiency testing program for water is unacceptably limited. ELAB recommends that EPA act quickly to broaden the availability of proficiency testing samples for matrices other than water (e.g. solid waste, air, tissue, etc.)	EPA had no plans for oversight beyond WS/WP, so data base not designed to handle broader program.	Recommendation remains open. Awaiting response from EMMC Policy Council	HIGH
40	1/14/99	ELAB recommends to NELAC that a) the NELAC standards become effective and enforceable one year after adoption, and b) that for the first group of laboratories to be accredited under NELAC standards, the 1999 standards be used for compliance and that the related timelines for acceptance of		Recommendation remains open. Awaiting response from NELAC Board.	COMPLETED

Rec #	Date of Rec	Recommendation	Notes	Action	ELAB Priority
		applications be adjusted accordingly.			
41	12/10/98	<p>ELAB recommends that work should forge on for field measurement standards. It was agreed that field sampling should be approached to determine the needs of stakeholders for standard-setting.</p> <p>ELAB recommends that the Field Measurements ad hoc committee compile the variability associated with field sampling, collect field sampling protocols, review ISO guides for approaches, consult stakeholders, and re-visit the needs of EPA/OAR on the matter of field sampling.</p>		<p>Recommendation remains open. Awaiting response from FM committee.</p> <p>Assigned to A. Verstuyft who will compose a list of key issues for the 4/11/00 teleconference.</p> <p>A. Verstuyft asked Mr. Dan Bivins, OAR, to take recommendation to the Field Sampling Committee for their response at June, 2000 meeting (4/11/00).</p>	HIGH
42	3/1/99	ELAB recommends to NELAC that the lab inspections be done according to NELAC standards and that the national database only track whether a lab is accredited and not have a separate category for interim status.	ELAB, at request of C. Batterton, NELAC BoD, considered the need for a new on-site related to the timing of the first Accrediting Authority recognitions in July 1999.	ELAB letter sent to NELAC, 3/25/99. Awaiting action by NELAC.	HIGH
43	12/17/99	Ensure consistency and coordination between USEPA regulations, guidance, and policies and the NELAC standards		Assigned to Regulatory Consistency subcommittee	
44	12/17/99	ELAB will address reconciliation & integration of ISO and NELAC standards		Assigned to NELAC-ISO	

Rec #	Date of Rec	Recommendation	Notes	Action	ELAB Priority
				Consistency subcommittee Ms. Robinson is presenting overview comparison of ISO 25 and ISO 17025 at open forum June 26, 2000.	
45	12/17/99	ELAB will review reporting information of NELAC national database			
46	12/17/99	ELAB will prepare Awhite paper@on advantages of national laboratory accreditation		Assigned to National Laboratory Accreditation Issues subcommittee	
47	12/17/99	ELAB to review process for developing PT acceptance limits under privatized PT program relative to regulatory requirements		Assigned to NELAC PT committee	
48	12/17/99	ELAB will review NELAC Fields of Testing with respect to EPA's structure		Assigned to Scope of Accreditation subcommittee	
49	12/17/99	ELAB will review issues of QC samples, including field QC and matrix spikes		Assigned to QC Standards subcommittee	
50	2/15/00	ELAB will send letter to Quality Systems Committee asking that Section 5.12.4 be removed from the Standard.		Letter sent. Quality Systems Committee denied request. ELAB is taking issue to Accrediting Authorities Committee meeting on April 18, 2000 and Board of	

Rec #	Date of Rec	Recommendation	Notes	Action	ELAB Priority
				Directors meeting on April 13, 2000.	